

## **Marty McHenry Comments**

In reviewing the revised land use plan scenarios for Tract 3, I would like to make the following comments regarding each of the revised scenarios in terms of those aspects viewed both favorably and unfavorably:

Regarding scenario 1, the Mixed Use area north of Oyster Creek would be a nice use of that area if, the envisioned use of this area is to create a distinct area of the city that would embellish and extend the redevelopment of the Imperial Sugar site. This area could easily and naturally support the historic and cultural goals of the city. Recognizing that we can possibly influence, but not control, the redevelopment of the Imperial Sugar site, this area could be used to create a historic/cultural district in which we could control and still tie into what is probably the most historically significant landmark we have. Furthermore, this area, along with the retail area across from it and directly behind the Nalco site, could be used to create the “river walk” concept as has been mentioned in previous public hearings.

In scenario 1a, the use of a green buffer in the far northeast tip of the area bounded by Oyster Creek and just south of Gannoway Lake is strongly supported, as this is needed to transition the Sugar Mill neighborhood, particularly those who enjoy the community swimming pool, tennis courts and Misty Lake.

Aspects shared by both scenarios 1 and 1a which I am opposed to include:

- (1). the large amount of Planned Residential
- (2). the use of Single Family Residential around Gannoway Lake
- (3). the use of “Office/Neighborhood Services” and “Retail” along Hwy 6

Concerning the use of “Planned Residential” - although encouraged that any “Planned Residential” would not be of a density greater than that of a typical Single Family Residential community, the types of housing product included in this category is of great concern, especially considering the size of these areas. Besides, the designation of “Mixed Use” provides for a certain amount of housing product types included in the “Planned Residential” category. I would not favor seeing more of this type of housing as that already provided for in the Mixed Use area.

Concerning the use of “Single Family Residential” around Gannoway Lake - it would seem that this could conflict with any park/natural area that could be built in this area. These areas are also where public access (i.e., driveways/parking lots) to this natural area will likely be required.

Concerning the use of “Office/Neighborhood Services” and “Retail” along Hwy 6 - I am concerned that this would be conducive to continuing what one gentleman described as the retail “blight” that exists to the north along Hwy 6. In addition, it does not seem that convenient to the neighborhoods intended to be served.

There are many aspects of scenarios 2 and 2a which I favor:

- (1). the greenbelts around Gannoway Lake and the northeast tip bounded by Oyster Creek
- (2). the designation of “Single Family Residential” instead of “Planned Residential”

(3). the designation of a “Mixed Use” area just north of Oyster Creek, again, if this is envisioned to serve as a “historical/cultural” district and/or upscale waterfront retail establishment.

However, I am opposed to the use of “Retail” along Hwy 6 shown in Scenario 2 for two reasons. First, as already mentioned, the fear of spreading the Hwy 6 retail “blight”, and second, the strong desire to have more office/R&D (which is shown as “Light Industrial”) use in the area.

This leaves us with scenario 2a as being most favorable. However, there are some modifications which I would highly recommend. First, in the “lobe” bounded by Oyster Creek shown as “Light Industrial” and “Single Family Residential”, please increase the amount of “Light Industrial” and reduce the amount of “Single Family Residential” by an equal amount. This will increase the number of available jobs in the area while reducing the number of residences expected to cut through Sugar Mill on Jess Pirtle in their commute to Houston. I would anticipate that the majority of people coming to work in this new office park would flow in and out from the south and west via Hwy 6, US 90A and the future University Blvd, thus avoiding the impact expected from residential uses upon the adjacent neighborhoods. Of course, in saying this, I am assuming that “Light Industrial” in this area does not mean what we see currently in our existing “Light Industrial” office park. Rather, as has been noted previously, this “Light Industrial” should have strict standards regarding building height, design and buffering so as to create an attractive, high quality office park containing only the industries targeted by the city’s economic development study. In fact, if building height could be such so as to not be visible from the Sugar Mill subdivision, this entire area could be designated as “Light Industrial”, though perhaps a larger “Single Family Residential” area is needed in order to provide the number of residences needed to support the amenities typically found in a master planned community, such as recreational facilities. The second modification I would suggest would be to decrease the amount of Mixed Use area north of Oyster creek and replace that by an equal amount of “Single Family Residential”. The amount currently shown just seems like too much retail considering the amount already provided for in both the “Retail” areas and the “Mixed Use” area covering the Imperial Sugar site. I believe we can reap the benefit of a nice waterfront retail/residential area without this area being so large. A third modification I would suggest would be to “connect the loop” of the trail system that will hopefully be built around Oyster Creek. Doing so would provide an excellent jogging/biking trail for the community, in which one would be able to park at a convenient location, jog or bike along scenic Oyster Creek and possibly never have to see the same scenery more than once. The attached file illustrates Scenario 2A with these modifications.

Finally, I would like to say a word about the Thouroughfare Plan. I would strongly support alternate 2A over alternate 2 as shown on all scenario maps. If the Burney Bypass is to reduce the impact on Burney Rd and improve north/south flow, which is its stated purpose, alternate 2A seems most appropriate since it is the most direct north/south route. Furthermore, having a more direct route between Hwy 6 and Burney will likely increase the cut through traffic from Hwy 6 over to Hwy 59 via Jess Pirtle. We obviously

want to be able to service the new development on Tract 3 and improve the north/south traffic flow, but, we should do so while still encouraging traffic to use Hwy 6 and US 90A instead of the thoroughfares bisecting established neighborhoods and passing by elementary schools.